Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,715	OSBORN, WALTER A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew O Savage	1723
All Participants:	Status of Application:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(1) Matthew O Savage.	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. Ken Pedersen</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>13 May 2004</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	olicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 5, 6, and new claims 7 and 8		
Prior art documents discussed: Prior art of record.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applie	cant/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to cancel claim 5 of which, upon reconsideration was considered obvious over Dixon in view of Sticher et al. Agreed to amend claim 6 to patently distinguish over Dixon and to clarify the location of various elements recited in the claim in relation to each other. Agreed to add new claims 7 and 8 covering the details of the pick-up assembly and discharge tube, respectively. See the attached examiner's amendment for details..